



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 150
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,208	07/24/2003	John Favazza	063170.6567(20000432)	9671
5073	7590	05/31/2007		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER GELAGAY, SHEWAYE	
			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 05/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mike.furr@bakerbotts.com
ptomail1@bakerbotts.com

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on March 6, 2007. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7-8 have been amended. Claims 2, 4 and 9-17 are canceled. Claims 18-23 are withdrawn. New claims 24-32 have been added. Claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 24-32 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on March 6, 2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 32 is a system claim without any structural component and consists solely of language that is implemented with only software. Claim 32 does not provide any functional interrelationship to any software and hardware structural components to provide certain function that is processed by a computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. A system needs some structural component and cannot consist solely of language that could be implemented as operating instructions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 24-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishra et al. ("Security Services Markup Language") in view of Hallam-Baker ("Security Assertions Markup Language").

As per claims 1, 7, 26 and 32:

Mishra teaches a method comprising intercepting at an agent a web service customer access to a first web service, the agent residing between the web service customer and the first web service and between the web service customer and a second web service; [Section 3.1: User-Driven Transactions (Single Sign-On); Section 4.1: Name assertions and Entitlements; Section 4.3: Authentication (auth) and

authorization (Az) Services] collecting at the agent one or more credentials of the web service customer; [Section 3.1: User-Driven Transactions (Single Sign-On); Section 4.1: Name assertions and Entitlements; Section 4.3: Authentication (auth) and authorization (Az) Services] determining at the agent whether the web service customer is authenticated and authorized; [Section 3.1: User-Driven Transactions (Single Sign-On); Section 4.1: Name assertions and Entitlements; Section 4.3: Authentication (auth) and authorization (Az) Services] if the web service customer is authenticated and authorized, at the agent: granting the first request; initiating creation of a session and a session ticket; obtaining a session ticket ID for the session ticket; [Section 3.1: User-Driven Transactions (Single Sign-On); Section 4.1: Name assertions and Entitlements; Section 4.3: Authentication (auth) and authorization (Az) Services] intercepting a second request to grant the web service customer access to the second web service, the second request comprising the assertion and a private key; [Section 3.1: User-Driven Transactions (Single Sign-On); Section 4.1: Name assertions and Entitlements; Section 4.3: Authentication (auth) and authorization (Az) Services] and if the private key matches the public key in the assertion, grant the second request without reauthenticating or reauthorizing the web service customer. [Section 3.1: User-Driven Transactions (Single Sign-On); Section 4; Section 4.1: Name assertions and Entitlements; Section 4.3: Authentication (auth) and authorization (Az) Services; Section 4.4. Assertion Validity] Mishra does not explicitly disclose encrypting the session ticket ID and a public key into an assertion. Hallam-Baker in analogues art, however, discloses encrypting the session ticket ID and a public key into an assertion. [Section

2.3: Relying Server; Section 3.2: Ticket; Section 5.4: Session Management/Distributed Log out]. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Mishra with Hallam-Baker in order to provide a compact data structure that identifies a particular assertion in the minimal space available in a URL fragment or HTTP cookie. (page 6, Section 3.2: Ticket; Hallam-Baker)

As per claims 3, 8 and 27:

The combination of Mishra and Hallam-Baker teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Hallam-Baker further discloses a method wherein the assertion comprises a Security Assertions Markup Language (SAML) assertion. (page 4, 2. Abstract Data Flow)

As per claims 5 and 28:

The combination of Mishra and Hallam-Baker teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Mishra further discloses a method wherein the agent comprises an Extensible Markup Language (XML) agent. (Section 2.3: Services)

As per claims 6 and 29:

The combination of Mishra and Hallam-Baker teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Mishra further discloses a method wherein the processors are further operable to determine whether the web service customer is authenticated and authorized comprises comparing the web service customer with a database containing authentication and authorization data. (Section 4.3: Authentication (auth) and authorization (Az) Services)

As per claims 24 and 30:

The combination of Mishra and Hallam-Baker teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Mishra further discloses a method wherein the first request and the second request both originate at the web service customer; and the method further comprising communicating the assertion to the web service customer to enable the web service customer to access the second web service without reauthentication or reauthorization after the web service customer accesses the first web service. [Section 3.1: User-Driven Transactions (Single Sign-On); Section 3.2: Service-Driven Transactions; Section 4.1: Name assertions and Entitlements; Section 4.3: Authentication (auth) and authorization (Az) Services]

As per claims 25 and 31:

The combination of Mishra and Hallam-Baker teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Mishra further discloses a method wherein the first request originates at the web service customer and the second request originates at the first web service; and the method further comprising communicating the assertion to the first web service to enable the web service customer to access the second web service without reauthentication or reauthorization after the web service customer accesses the first web service. [Section 3.1: User-Driven Transactions (Single Sign-On); Section 3.2: Service-Driven Transactions; Section 4.1: Name assertions and Entitlements; Section 4.3: Authentication (auth) and authorization (Az) Services]

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shewaye Gelagay *SG*


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER